

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,418) in view of Fowler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,977).

Referring to Claim 1, Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a user interface manager capable of accessing a data storage system and being operative to provide an executable applet to a remote browser application, the applet generating a user interface within the browser application for monitoring and adjusting settings and thresholds of at least one of one or more rectifier subsystems, one or more reserve power subsystems, and/or one or more power distribution subsystems.

Collins et al. teach an energy management system for monitoring and analyzing power consumption from different locations. Energy monitoring devices that include electric utility meters from one or more locations are connected to a computer network such as the Internet (col. 3, line 51). A primary server is also connected to the computer network and receives energy usage data from the energy monitoring devices. The primary server and an associated database perform an energy cost analysis and generate energy usage statistics based on the energy usage data (col. 6, line 36). One

or more remote monitoring stations communicate with the primary server across the computer network to review the energy usage data (col. 7, line 19).

The remote monitoring stations are capable of turning on and off a generator across the computer network (col. 5, line 65). However, the remote monitoring stations do not adjust settings and thresholds of either the generator or the energy monitoring devices, as required by the claims. Furthermore, neither the generator nor the energy monitoring devices supply respective settings and thresholds to the primary server in order to be viewed by users of the remote monitoring stations. The energy monitoring devices only supply energy usage data and the primary server is limited to turning the generator on when certain conditions exist.

For example, the remote monitoring stations are unable to adjust settings and thresholds such as current and/or voltage tolerances of the generator when a problem is detected as taught by Applicants. The remote monitoring stations and the primary server monitor usage of the generator for billing purposes and to determine peak usage times (col. 8, lines 21). This is different from adjusting specific settings and/or thresholds that affect how the energy management system operates.

Collins et al. also do not show, teach, or suggest a user interface manager being operative to receive data values generated by the applet in response to user interaction via the user interface and to communicate the data values to the data storage system for use in adjusting the settings and thresholds.

The remote monitoring stations access the primary server to review the energy usage data from the energy monitoring devices and the generator. The remote monitoring stations are also capable of activating the generator. However, the remote

monitoring stations do not transmit information to the primary server for use in adjusting the settings and thresholds of the generator and the energy monitoring devices, as required by the claims. Therefore, in the energy management system taught by Collins et al., an on-site technician is required to adjust settings and thresholds of the generator and the energy monitoring devices. On page 2, line 1 of the Application as originally filed, Applicants teach that skilled engineers may be required to make changes to power supply systems for telecommunications equipment in the event of power outages. Such skilled engineers are very expensive.

Fowler et al. do not remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. Fowler et al. teach a system for monitoring computer networks and equipment. The system includes sensors that detect physical parameters associated with a room such as a network room and/or devices in the room such as network servers (Abstract). The sensors are programmed to monitor the physical parameters such as temperature and to generate alarm signals when any of the physical parameters are outside of an allowable range. The sensors may also store physical parameters that are collected over a time period in memory (Abstract). Remote users may utilize a network-based interface to view current or past physical parameters and to adjust allowable ranges for the physical parameters.

The system taught by Fowler et al. does not monitor and control the network room and the network devices, as required by the claims. The system monitors and controls sensors that detect physical parameters of the network room and the network devices. In other words, operations of the devices being monitored by the sensors are not affected when a user adjusts allowable ranges of physical parameters in the sensors. The sensors are used strictly for monitoring physical parameters and

optionally taking action when the parameters are outside of an allowable range. Therefore, in the system taught by Fowler et al., a remote user is unable to change settings and thresholds of the network devices to prevent damage to the network devices when a problem or malfunction occurs. This necessitates the use of on-site technicians, which is avoided in the system taught by Applicants.

Therefore, Collins et al. would not have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Fowler et al. to create the remote user interface system claimed by Applicants. Both Collins et al. and Fowler et al. teach utilizing remote user interfaces to observe sensors or data that is collected by the sensors. The remote user interfaces do not adjust settings and thresholds of the devices that the sensors monitor. Collins et al. suggest remotely activating a generator. However, the generator is activated to supplement energy provided by utility companies in order to save money. A remote user is not able to adjust settings and thresholds of the generator itself.

On page 2, line 12, Applicants teach that power outages that occur over a widespread region may require engineers and technicians to visit numerous sites, which is very difficult and time consuming. Therefore, Applicants teach monitoring and controlling a power system by coupling a monitor and control system to subsystems of the power system. The monitoring and control system obtains operating state information from the subsystems and stores the operating state information in a data storage system. The operating state information includes settings and thresholds of the subsystems. Users may remotely adjust the settings and thresholds in order to adjust operation of the subsystems. The subsystems periodically detect changes in the operating state information to maintain updated settings and thresholds. Therefore,

unlike the systems taught by Collins et al. and Fowler et al., remote users are able to directly adjust operations of the subsystems.

Claims 2-11 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Fowler et al. for the same reasons.

Referring to Claim 12, Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest a user interface manager capable of accessing a data storage system and being operative to provide an executable applet to a remote browser application, the applet generating a user interface within the browser application for monitoring and adjusting settings and thresholds of a power system.

The arguments made above with respect to Claim 1 are equally applicable to Claim 12. The remote monitoring stations taught by Collins et al. do not adjust settings and thresholds of either the generator or the energy monitoring devices. Furthermore, neither the generator nor the energy monitoring devices supply respective settings and thresholds to the primary server in order to be viewed by users of the remote monitoring stations. The energy monitoring devices only supply energy usage data and the primary server is limited to turning the generator on when certain conditions exist.

Fowler et al. do not remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. The system taught by Fowler et al. does not monitor and control the network room and the network devices. Furthermore, operations of the devices being monitored by the sensors are not affected when a user adjusts allowable ranges of physical parameters in the sensors. The sensors are used strictly for monitoring physical parameters and optionally taking action when the parameters are outside of an allowable range.

Claims 13-22 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Fowler et al. for the same reasons.

Referring to Claim 23, Collins et al. do not show, teach, or suggest using control information generated by an applet running on a computer to adjust settings and thresholds of a telecommunications power system via a network.

The arguments made above with respect to Claim 1 are equally applicable to Claim 23. The remote monitoring stations taught by Collins et al. do not adjust settings and thresholds of either the generator or the energy monitoring devices. Neither the generator nor the energy monitoring devices supply respective settings and thresholds to the primary server in order to be viewed by users of the remote monitoring stations.

Fowler et al. do not remedy the shortcomings of Collins et al. The system taught by Fowler et al. does not monitor and control the network room and the network devices. Operations of the devices being monitored by the sensors are not affected when a user adjusts allowable ranges of physical parameters in the sensors.

Claims 24-28 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 23 and are allowable over Collins et al. and Fowler et al. for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/19/05

By: Michael D. Wiggins
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/wmt